

STATEMENT OF M. ROBERT BARNETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.  
TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 13, 1959

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee on Special Education, the timeliness of the hearings which you have scheduled about matters pertaining to blindness and proposals for legislation affecting services to blind persons in the United States is rather significant. For well over one hundred years, our American society, through its voluntary and governmental organizations, has been among the leading in the world in providing educational and rehabilitative programs for blind persons, as well as relatively generous provisions for meeting basic subsistence needs. Since about 1900 in general and more dramatically since the 20's, a great deal of progress has been made both in quantity and quality of aid to the blind--although still far short of the need.

One might say that the array of services and benefits that have been made available has been a bit-by-bit effort on the part of our society to bring about the end of a condition of dependency which, not many generations ago, was the automatic and irrevocable result of the happenstance of blindness. The growth of institutions and services, however, has not always contributed to a defeat of the old tendency toward dependency, and in some cases, has contributed to a continuation of lives of isolation and the much believed helplessness of persons who are blind. In fact, during the past decade one might say that our society has gone rather fully into a sharp conflict between traditional attitudes toward the blind as a group on the one hand and the newer concept of the individuality of blind people on the other. The issues which have been the natural result--the

inevitable, the unavoidable, and the desirable result--have been coming out more and more of late in both professional and popular circles all over the country. There are many of us who specialize in this field who have known that this fundamental conflict will and must occur. Since the Federal Government of the United States of America has become probably the greatest single influence in the problems and on the potentialities of blind persons--leaving out the more personal and intimate influence of the immediate family of an individual--it is time that our national Congress should assess the situation economically, philosophically and professionally and attempt to determine where publicly supported programs for blind persons go from here.

I consider it a privilege as well as a responsibility to participate in these hearings. To be specific, I understand that I am addressing myself, at this time, to the question of certain bills which have been introduced into the Congress and which it is this Committee's responsibility to consider. These bills are in two categories. The first are those that are all of a similar content and which are, with a few minor exceptions, identical to H.R. 14, a bill introduced by the Honorable Walter S. Baring of Nevada and which is entitled "A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind." As of this date, I understand that there are approximately 56 other Congressional sponsors in the House of Representatives, and about 33 sponsors of similar measures in the United States Senate. The other category of bills which, it is my understanding, you are to consider would establish some form of Presidentially-appointed study commission which, given adequate appropriations, would assemble a research staff for an intensive and comprehensive study of the over-all problem of blindness in America. There are currently three such measures. They are: H.R. 5243, introduced by the

Honorable John E. Fogarty; H.R. 356, introduced by the Honorable Carl Elliott; and H.R. 1855, introduced by the Honorable D. R. (Billy) Matthews, and 19 bills identical to Mr. Matthews' bill. A study of these bills show that they differ in certain respects, a few of which have rather major implications and which I would like to comment upon later in this testimony.

I wish to indicate at this time that I would consider it a very unfortunate thing if the Congress should enact into law any proposal which embodies the principle import of the first set of bills, i.e., those of Mr. Baring and its companions. I am just as earnestly hoping that the Congress on the other hand would enact into law a bill which embodies the principle import of the second set, i.e., those of Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Matthews and others of a similar nature.

#### REASON FOR OPPOSING H.R. 14

Why am I opposed to those bills which by title and superficial reading seem innocuous indeed, simply guaranteeing "the blind" the right to self-expression and the right to organize. For Several reasons---There is a real question as to the need for any statute that would guarantee the right of any particular group of people to organize and to express themselves in this democracy. I am a blind person myself, and know of nothing that stands in the way of my basic rights as a citizen to enjoy all of our precious American freedom. Second, the passage of such a law would be a precedent for a host of other special groups, especially those concerned with assistance extended to them through Federal legislation, to seek the passage of similar useless legislation. Third, the section of the proposal which would require the administrators of Federal programs to consult with representatives of organizations of the blind would impose upon the administrative structure in government another cumbersome requirement, which would be a handicap to efficiency and a source of unsound influences of a self-

serving character. Fourth, I personally view the measure as an indication of gross misunderstanding of the lives and hopes of the great mass of individuals who become blind. It suggests--it even gives formal recognition by our great assembly of national leaders and thinkers in the Congress to the archaic, sentimental and hideous notion that blind people live in a world set apart from all others, and that the nicest and kindest thing to do is for society in general to let the poor things "speak for themselves" through some wierd governmental system of their own--a strange society of darkness within our larger society, one into which the professional skills and judgment of all other competencies should not enter unless their eyes were first blinded.

#### REASON FOR FAVORING STUDY

Why am I, on the other hand, urging you to favorably consider bills which would provide for a study commission? Simply because of the long conviction on the part of my organization, and many, many people whom I know to be knowledgeable, that there definitely is a need to investigate the low level of services to blind people in this country. I suggest that all of those who so genuinely believe in the need for the legislation proposed by Mr. Baring and others are in their way expressing dissatisfaction with the manner, the quality and quantity of such aid, even where the soundness and wisdom of the program content or the original intent of Congress is beyond question.

#### TWELVE PROBLEM AREAS

I should like to present to you a few brief references to specific problems already known to the American Foundation for the Blind--and others, of course--in an effort to provide the Committee with a greater understanding of these problems. When I have finished the next few minutes, I hope I will have been able to show the problem of blindness in this country to be one of very

significant proportions--a problem for which the proposals of Mr. Baring and others are not a cure, but rather only eloquent symptoms.

It will be impossible for me to impose upon the time of this Committee to present full particulars of each of the dozen points I intend to make. I have brought along certain published reports, however, to which I will refer. There are sufficient copies in the possession of the clerk for all of you. If the Chairman wishes or will permit, they may be circulated to you. I am not asking that they be made a part of the record, since they are readily available at all times, as are a great many additional references for the use of interested individuals or groups.

1. THE STATISTICAL PICTURE -- I wish first to direct your attention to the question of numbers. There are several current sources of fairly reliable statistics. The American Foundation for the Blind, the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, and various units within the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare are among them--and most of us base our continuing statistical studies on the original work of Dr. Ralph G. Hurlin of the Russell Sage Foundation.<sup>1</sup> One can generally estimate any locality's extent of blindness by applying certain formulae to its general population. At the moment, the best estimates place the total number of blind people in the United States at about 350,000. Statisticians predict that the number will be in excess of 400,000 by 1970. About 10 per cent are of school age, meaning more accurately under 21, while the most significant age breakdown is that of 65 years of age and over, into which category more than half of the total number falls. Somewhere in

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Ralph G. Hurlin of Russell Sage Foundation, "Estimated Prevalence of Blindness in the United States", AFB monograph, October, 1953, 15 pp.

between are those of so-called employable age. However, the actual percentage of clearly employable people comes down markedly because of factors which complicate simple blindness.

2. THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEM OF THE AGING WHO ARE BLIND -- The large percentage of the elderly to be found in the population of blindness is the direct result of diseases of the eye that occur largely after the middle years--a matter of general knowledge, of course. Most of those in this group have led more or less average lives--workers or wives, fathers or mothers and probably already in the role of grandfather or grandmother. Blindness comes as a shattering added "last straw" and the individual and his household suffer intensely. What is there for these people? For those in financial need--virtually pauperized, that is--there is the nation's public assistance program. For those who know about it, there is library service in the form of Talking Books--braille books, too, if they can learn to read it and there is a teacher available to teach it. This whole area of the aging blind might be considered one of the great unknowns in this field and certainly must be studied. I will say, however, that there is virtually no program for the blind in the entire country that is realistically geared to help these older folks over the rough spots--they are in the main the forgotten ones. Perhaps the answer lies in workshops, both integrated and specialized, or in recreational centers, or in sensible programs for the occupation of the home-bound. No one knows. Scattered efforts toward employment of persons in their homes have been going on in this country for probably 30 years, but none to my knowledge has ever resulted in significant personal income to an appreciable number. Most such programs have been disparaged as "make them happy" activities. Realizing this, the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the American Foundation for the

Blind, and National Industries for the Blind joined in financing and directing an experimental pilot project in the State of Vermont. The report of that two-year demonstration is being circulated to you.<sup>1</sup> It shows that much can be done; but unfortunately, I have to report that its evidence has not been picked up in other States and not as well as it might be even in the State of Vermont.

3. THE EMPLOYABLE GROUP -- It should be remembered that many persons may continue in their same occupation after loss of sight, or in a slight modification of it, and with little or no help from rehabilitation agencies. However, the nature of blindness is such that the great majority require considerable assistance--assistance of a type which is proper for rehabilitation agencies to perform. Adjustment services, rehabilitation training and placement, however, involve techniques and processes of a highly skilled nature, and half-done measures may be worse than none at all in their effect upon the life of the individual and his family. Rehabilitation centers have grown in this country over the past fifteen years along lines generally felt by leaders to be in the right direction, and many have done good work. In 1956, a group of individuals with a basis for competency met at New Orleans under the auspices of the Foundation and the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The objective of the seminar was to propose, agree upon, and disseminate to all what might be considered as suggested standards for such centers. The material is found in the booklet called "Rehabilitation Centers for Blind Persons."<sup>2</sup> I wish to make the observation at this

<sup>1</sup>M. Roberta Townsend, "The Vermont Story - A Pilot Study on Industrial Homework In A Rural State - 1955-1957", 55 pp.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Aycock, Arthur L. Voorhees, Kathern F. Gruber, "Rehabilitation Centers For Blind Persons", Report of Seminar held in New Orleans, La., in February 1956. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 43 pp.

time that probably not more than two or three of the centers in existence today meet those standards fully. Every one of them directly or indirectly renders its client service with the aid of Federal funds.

Adjustment help should normally lead to employment. Adjustment and placement help need not be provided only in centers. Individual personnel can do an excellent job, and many have. Nevertheless, general observation shows that placement lags very far behind what theory might expect it to be in the aggregate. Further, some studies show that too many placements do not "stick"--- meaning the rehabilitation has not been lasting. I do not wish to mention here for ethical reasons the specific community study or studies in mind; but in one western state, a Foundation survey of a five-year placement record showed that not one of the rehabilitants was employed some months later.

The sort of damning that the foregoing seems to be enjoying is to be taken seriously, but not as an implication that there is any willful negligent attitude on the part of any personnel or agencies involved. Many answers can be suggested. My purpose here, however, is to show only that the answers are not easily recognized, that study is needed, and that steps toward improvement are urgently required.

4. THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOLING --- The concept that a blind child can be educated is two centuries old. In this country, residential schools came into existence nearly 150 years ago. Today there are about 12,000 children in the elementary and secondary school grades, divided almost evenly between local school systems and residential schools. In addition to the 48 academy-type facilities, there are currently about 300 local school systems involved. Medical information indicates that the trend should be downward in totals, due to the control lately of retrolental fibroplasia. The Federal Government, through the



American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Kentucky,<sup>1</sup> has been extending to the states for three-quarters of a century a small portion of the cost of educating these children. The aid is in the form of a centralized supply of books and teaching materials--basically vital to the process. There are many who are seriously concerned about the ability of the program to meet the growing demand, and there is real question of the program's present adequacy. While we do not intend here to make any effort to secure your support of specific measures which are part of our country's over-all problem of educating exceptional children, I do emphasize that this is a fundamental subject that needs urgent and dynamic study.

5. EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION -- All who are involved in the education of blind children are wrestling continually with professional and economic issues. Some light is being shed on the problem, and some recommendations are available-- thanks not only to my own organization, but also to such groups as the American Association of Instructors of the Blind and the Council of State Directors of Special Education, aided by certain universities. I call your attention to just one of many studies--commonly called the "Pine Brook Report."<sup>2</sup>

6. THE PROBLEM OF THE INDIGENT BLIND -- It is estimated that about one-half of all American blind people currently are receiving financial aid through the Federal-State program of public assistance. This program, then, is by far the most numerically significant of all Federally-supported benefits. The coverage is

<sup>1</sup>In process of publishing report on "National Conference on the Preparation and Distribution of Educational Materials for Blind Children", jointly sponsored by the Foundation and the American Printing House for the Blind.

<sup>2</sup>American Foundation for the Blind, "Pine Brook Report - National Work Session on the Education of the Blind with the Sighted", 1957 revised, 72 pp.

quite good, and total appropriations probably seem generous. However, there are many problems in the administration of the aid. Not only is the average amount of individual aid too small, there also seems to be too great a tendency toward unnecessarily strict review of the private lives of recipients. As a result, there is general unrest among people for whom society intended a degree of contentment. There are those who argue that all blind persons should be provided a pension--a handicap allowance, as it were--free of any means test. It is argued that security of mind about basic maintenance would tend to increase incentive toward vocational effort. As we all are aware, some partial steps in the direction of greater security already have been taken, notably through the provision that a certain amount of earned income may be disregarded by the State in the case of a blind aid recipient who goes to work. It is my understanding that the officials of the Bureau of Public Assistance, observing the program since this provision was initiated in 1954, now say that there has been no noticeable trend toward rehabilitation among such recipients--or to put it more bluntly, individuals who are extended the earned income exemption as an incentive toward self-support actually do not move out of the assistance case load.

I realize that the whole question of philosophy of public assistance is much broader than that which involves just the indigent blind. Notwithstanding other studies of the question, however, I believe that this special category is in urgent need of careful and competent research and analysis that it is not getting. A very large number of persons are dependent upon this program for their very existence, and it is all too clear that in too many instances the aid is a source of worry rather than a comfort.

7. IS DISABILITY INSURANCE WORKING? -- The American Foundation for the Blind fully realizes that a discussion of more liberal Social Security disability

insurance provisions can be controversial. Nevertheless, for a number of years we have been among those serious-minded organizations who believe that the soundest way for our country to help people meet the financial stress imposed by inability to work is through the simple extension of the basic principle of our present Social Security program. We believe that regardless of the age at which blindness, for example, occurs and if the individual to whom it happens has been a worker for any period of time in a covered occupation, that he should immediately be eligible for the receipt of his income as though he had reached the age of retirement. It should be recognized that the physical loss with its accompanying personal and vocational adjustment problems does make the individual "permanently and totally disabled" in the meaning of the law. However, we firmly believe that a very large percentage of those same individuals, although totally blind, would return to the labor market if there was no fear of the loss of the basic security to be found in the cash insurance payment. We understand, however, that even the first step in this hopeful new approach as seen in the existing provisions already is showing administrative imperfections, but have ourselves not yet had sufficient time or resources to appraise whether these unforeseen administrative problems actually are preventing the realization of the intent. This, again, is a very large and important area which needs considerable study.

8. THE PREDICTABLE BREAKDOWN IN LIBRARY SERVICES -- Between 50 and 60 thousand blind Americans are enjoying what I believe to be the finest library service for the blind in the world--comprised, as you know, of recorded "Talking Books" and books in Braille. The progress made in this field of service is remarkable, and the Library of Congress as the central leader of all groups concerned should be complimented. Here again, though, there is a need for immediate improvement in planning, plus consistent adherence to policies judged to be the

best for the ultimate realization of the total objective. The number of users of the service may well double within ten to fifteen years, and it is generally safe to say that the present distribution system is already over-taxed. Not more than 25 per cent of the libraries that carry out this Federally-equipped program meet fully the standards that they should. The answer to the problems is, of course, to be found in more money, but not entirely. I, for one, advocate Federal appropriation of funds to go along with the book stock and leadership, while others feel that the cash cost is the responsibility of the States. Whatever the outcome, further study of this Federal activity is in process and should be coordinated with other recommended studies. I wish to call your attention to one very important recent report in this field--the "Survey of Library Service For The Blind - 1956", by Francis R. St. John, project director and editor.<sup>1</sup>

9. PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALS IN THE RANDOLPH-SHEPPARD PROGRAM -- As a result of the law passed in 1936 (Public Law 732), commonly known as the Randolph-Sheppard Act, thousands of blind persons have been aided in one particular field of employment--the operation of small merchandising establishments on Federal property. Vending stands spread into other public buildings and as a result of the combined demonstration, many have been put into operation in industrial or other private locations. This program, however, has been riddled for years by too many arbitrary, costly, and confusing obstacles. In some areas of the country, the red tape involved in persuading lesser Federal department officials, employee groups, building custodians, and the like makes it virtually too costly to attempt to take advantage of the opportunity that Congress clearly made available.

<sup>1</sup>Francis R. St. John, "Survey of Library Service For The Blind - 1956", American Foundation for the Blind, November 1957, 134 pp.

To make matters worse, people in our own field have engaged in local and national controversy over ways and means to administer the program---ranging all the way from questions of ownership to questions concerned with providing the expenses for promotion and supervision and to the kinds of merchandise that should be sold. Neither the Federal departments in charge of its administration nor organizations like my own in the voluntary field have been able to resolve these questions, and a result has been the gradual slowing down of the whole movement. Perhaps the slow-down is an indication that this type of preferential legislation is basically unsound and cannot be inexpensively or smoothly operated. I am still of the opinion, however, that it is a valuable source of family support for many people, and am one of many who are seriously concerned about its fate. I am shocked and amazed at the petty vested interest that keeps raising its head to prevent the blind person from having the opportunity. I think some new law is indicated. I further think that even among ourselves it will be difficult to get such an improvement without increased violent discord---and I therefore again appeal to Congress to include this among other things in the proposed study. Facts and figures of interest are available in the report now being circulated to you.<sup>1</sup>

10. WHAT'S WRONG WITH WORKSHOPS? --- In 1938, the Congress passed the Wagner-O'Day Act, creating a Federal level Committee on the Purchases of Blind-Made Products. The committee, appointed by the President, supervises a rather extensive program through which many supplies needed by the various Federal departments are procured from workshops employing blind persons. The actual operation of the system is carried on by a nonprofit and nonfund-raising

<sup>1</sup>American Foundation for the Blind, "Vending Stand Program for Blind Persons", 1957, 128 pp.

organization known as National Industries for the Blind, Inc., located at 15 West 16th Street, New York City.

In terms of dollar value of the production thus stimulated, the Government's contribution to the employment of blind persons is significant. In terms of numbers directly or indirectly served, it is quite impressive. It is not my intention today to comment upon the values and/or problems that may be found in the Wagner-O'Day program, however. This Committee would be better served by hearing those most intimately associated with it. My concern is for the scores of workshops that cannot or do not qualify for part of the business.

To qualify for Government business, workshops must meet certain well-defined standards. The standards seem generally acceptable to all, and are quite rigid. The fact that most workshops operated by community agencies cannot meet those standards is a problem far more significant than the mere question of benefiting from Federal orders for merchandise. A cursory look at the average workshop shows it to be a floundering, badly-financed operation, serving an insignificant number of persons, and all too often serving even that small number with little that is good or wise. Many are already indirectly using Federal and State funds through tuition payments for training, and this is proper. More of it should happen. I say again, however, that if public funds are to purchase service for blind persons, that those services must meet known minimum standards. This is a very large and important area of rehabilitation and related social service potential that is in urgent need of study.

11. THE COMPLEXITY OF COORDINATION AT LOCAL LEVEL -- For the individual who becomes blind and who would avail himself of some of these services, the average community is a rather confusing and almost demoralizing maze of channels through which he must proceed. He will proceed, of course, only if he can get

started in the first place. Study after study by the Foundation in cooperation with others shows that the wonderful array of community agencies which exist to serve all people are not extending their programs to blind people. Even professionally trained staffs of community welfare agencies seem to demonstrate the same fundamental belief that blind people are a group set apart--and they are quite willing to leave this mysterious type of case to centers or agencies which exist only for the blind. Too many specialized agencies for the blind alone are unfamiliar with the help that a blind person can and should get from other agencies in the community. As a result, many private agencies--even those which directly or indirectly enjoy Federal funds--become little islands in the community where blind castaways remain incarcerated for the rest of their lives. The expense to society for continuing care is fantastic, and the cost to the life of the individual is anyone's guess. A fantasy report called the Middletown<sup>1</sup> Lighthouse is herewith shown to you. It is a theoretical story--but I assure you that it is a composite of known facts that are all too typical in most American localities.

12. PERSONNEL--THE KEY TO PROPER SERVICE -- There are between 4,000 and 5,000 specialized personnel in the field of services to or for blind persons, including education, rehabilitation, and all social services. Generally speaking, employers of these people are demanding qualifications far lower than they should be, and the salaries paid are without exception lower than comparable responsibilities are paid in other programs. I show you this rather bulky two-volume report of a study done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in cooperation with the

<sup>1</sup>American Foundation for the Blind, "The Middletown Lighthouse for the Blind - A Survey", August 1957, 52 pp.

United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Foundation. It reveals to the student of such things some rather depressing facts as a result of its survey of personnel practices in this field. The Foundation secured subsequently such a student by the name of Tickton to help us prepare a more easily read report. That report is in your hands.<sup>1</sup> As only one example of most of its content, one can find that in the field of vocational rehabilitation, a counselor of blind persons on the payroll of a public agency is paid several hundred dollars per year less than a counselor of other disabled people in the same state, city, and even department. Why is this? Many reasons can be found--probably the most insidious of which is the general thought that blindness is a state of inferiority and that persons serving them can be found among dedicated amateurs who will work because of extreme pity for the group. The generally bad level of service throughout this field will not improve until employers realize that blindness presents to the case worker even greater problems requiring professional skill than most other programs. Blind recipients of education or rehabilitation aid need workers with plus training on top of basic training--and they should be paid competitively. I offer this material to show you again that a study commission will find much material available for part of its own work--but also to show that these reports are only revelations of conditions which exist and not recommended solutions.

#### HOW BEST TO STUDY?

I sincerely hope that all this committee has heard and will hear will convince it and the Congress that there is ample grounds for believing that the

<sup>1</sup>Sidney G. Tickton, "Professional and Technical Workers for the Blind: How Much are they Paid?", American Foundation for the Blind, May 1958, 36 pp.



whole question of our American program on behalf of the blind needs objective appraisal. If there is agreement on that point--then how best to go about such an undertaking?

The several bills before this committee at the present time center upon one general approach--a high-level commission to be appointed by the President that would employ competent staff, receive the opinions and facts of all who have such things to present, and even initiate its own fact-finding program. Personally, I and my organization would welcome the passage of any one of the several versions. We tend, however, to favor most completely the version introduced by the Honorable John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island. These are our reasons:

1. Mr. Fogarty's draft seems to us to incorporate all the better provisions of the others and to go a step further. For example, it would provide for a relatively small, workable commission. It does not specify that particular interest groups should have "representative" membership, but rather that the composition of the commission should be a matter left to the discretion of the President and generally defined as persons of competency that is pertinent to the problem. To quote from the bill, "widely recognized leaders in public and private life and the pertinent professions."

2. Mr. Fogarty's version includes certain sections which define the areas to be studied. It is, of course, to be assumed that the other bills envision a commission scope of the same nature, but I happen to believe that in these days of many Congressionally authorized studies that the trend has been toward a more definitive outline of the scope of such studies. In this instance, you also should note that the language of Mr. Fogarty's bill restricts the study to Federally-supported service programs. We believe this to be a healthy

restriction, since on the one hand it concentrates the work of the commission upon that facet of aid to the blind that is using public funds and upon which there can and should be the imposition of standards, while on the other hand it would prevent the commission from becoming enmeshed in the complicated picture of private endeavor. This latter area needs attention too, but clarification of public services will go far toward clarification of the role and soundness of many voluntary organizations who represent their needs to the public in the form of fund-raising campaigns.

3. Mr. Fogarty's bill asks for an appropriation of \$450,000. The other drafts ask for less. I believe that the larger amount is absolutely necessary if the study is to be effective. There is budgetary documentation in support of that amount of money which is going to be submitted.

In summary and in closing, I personally feel a sense of frustration over this effort to present to you meaningful information and opinion. The subject of blindness is a very complex one. I am one of those who lives as a blind person--hit on all sides every day with all its ramifications. I am one who is employed as an administrator of a national voluntary research and service agency. Combined, these roles impose upon me the necessity to know this subject in all its aspects--and yet, I am increasingly humble over the extent of philosophy and fact that is beyond my understanding. On behalf of every person similarly handicapped--regardless of their station in life, and on behalf of society in general, I urgently repeat my hope that the Congress will find this field worthy of special consideration. This time, you are being asked to authorize an objective and scientific appraisal of problems, needs, and potentialities as a basis for improvement and expansion, rather than simply one more emotionally motivated bit of piecemeal legislation.